

X28  
157  
[Price 6d. each.]

# MUSLIM INDIA

AND

## ISLAMIC REVIEW.

RELIGION, ETHICS, POLITICS, LITERATURE, ART, COMMERCE.

*A Monthly Journal devoted to the Interests of the Muslims.*

Edited by KHWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN, B.A., LL.B.

VOL. I.] SEPTEMBER 1913. [No. 8.

### Contents.

	PAGE
Men of God: as Defined in the Quran	281
Precious Gems	282
The Holy Prophet and His Followers	283
Who is not a True Muslim	284
Questions and Answers on Islam	285
What will Jesus Find if He Come Again!	286
The Gospel of Hope	287
<b>Special Features of Islam</b> (Paper read in Paris Religions Congress.)	293
Mohammadanism and Christianity at the Old Bailey	303
Moslem Monogamy	308
White Wives of Brown Men (Letter by Sir John Rees, M P.)	309
Muslim Allegiance to the Caliph	309
A Hint to Wise Statesmanship	311
<b>The English Press on "Muslim India"</b>	314
Mr Asquith in Indian Press	316
Criteria	317

Price Six Shillings per annum post free in advance;  
and in India Rs. 5.

Single copies to be obtained from the Publisher, 99 Shoe Lane, London, E.C.,  
and in India from Azeezmanzal, Lahore.

London:

J. S. PHILLIPS, 99 SHOE LANE, E.C.



## NECESSARY NOTICE.

---

For the facility of the work, and to obviate unnecessary delay, a branch office of the "MUSLIM INDIA" has been opened in Lahore, Azeezmanzal, Nowlakha P.O.

Our Indian subscribers, as well as others, kindly note the following :—

1. Remittance of every description from India to Shaikh Rahmatullah, Esq., English Warehouse, Lahore.
2. All communications concerning the delivery or missing of any number of the Magazine, as well as for the enlistment of name as subscriber, &c., &c., from India to the Indian Manager, the "MUSLIM INDIA," Azeezmanzal, Nowlakha P.O., Lahore.
3. All other communications and contributions to the Magazine, personal letters, and remittances from other places excepting India to be addressed to Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, c/o National Bank of India, 26 Bishopsgate, London.
4. All communications respecting Advertisements from Indian Advertisers, and matters in bargain to Sh. Rahmatullah, Esq., English Warehouse.

THE MANAGER.

---

## IMPORTANT NOTICE.

---

Such of our Subscribers who miss any back number of "MUSLIM INDIA," &c., or wish to complete their file, are urgently requested to inform us by the next mail, as we intend to arrange for reprinting back numbers.

SH. NOORAHMAD,  
Manager.

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

# MUSLIM INDIA

AND

## ISLAMIC REVIEW.

---

VOL. I.]

SEPTEMBER 1913.

[No. 8.

---

### MEN OF GOD : AS DEFINED IN THE QURAN.

AND the servants of the God of Mercy are they who walk upon the earth softly ; and when the ignorant address them, they reply, "Peace!"

They that pass the night in the worship of their Lord prostrate and standing. And that say : "O, our Lord, turn away from us the torment of hell, for its torment is a great calamity . . . ."

Those who when they spend are neither lavish nor niggard, but keep the mean.

Those who call on no other gods with God, nor slay whom God hath forbidden to be slain, except for a just cause ; and who commit not fornication. . . .

And they who bear not witness to that which is false, and when they pass by frivolous sport, pass on with dignity.

And they, who when monished by the signs of their Lord, fall not down thereat as if deaf and blind.

And who say, "O, our Lord, give us in our wives and offspring the joy of our eyes, and make us leader of those who are righteous.—The Quran 25 : 65, 75.

"ISLAMIC REVIEW."—"Make us leader of those who are righteous!" What a sublime ideal, what a noble aspiration ; this prayer creates in us, let alone that righteousness is an impossibility, as some misguided creeds inculcate. These verses also show that godliness is not separate from daily life.



## PRECIOUS GEMS.

---

*From the Sayings of the Holy Prophet Mohammad.*  
(May the choicest blessings of God be upon his soul!)

---

### OUR DEALINGS WITH OUR RELATIONS.

---

**GOD WILL NOT BE AFFECTIONATE**  
to him who is not affectionate to God's creatures and to his own children.

**HE IS NOT OF US**  
who is not affectionate to his little ones and doth not respect the reputation of the old.

**THE PEOPLE FOR THE ABODE OF BLISS**  
are three: The first, a just king, a doer of good to his people, endowed with virtue; the second, an affectionate man and of a tender heart to relations and others; the third, a virtuous man.

#### WHO IS TRUE.

He is true who protecteth his brother both present and absent.

#### WHOSE SINS ARE FORGIVEN.

He who trieth to remove the want of his brother, whether he be successful or not, God will forgive his sins.

#### THE GREATEST CRIMES

are to associate another with God, to vex your father and mother, to murder your own species, to commit suicide, and to swear to a lie.

#### THE BEST OF MEN.

The best of you before God and His creations are those who are best in their own families. When your friend dieth, mention not his vices.

#### GOD'S PLEASURE.

is in a father's pleasure, and God's displeasure is in a father's displeasure.

#### THE FAVOUR OF GOD

doth not descend upon that family in which there is one who deserts his relations.

#### TO ENTER INTO PARADISE.

He who wisheth to enter paradise at the best door must please his father and mother.

#### TRUE ATONEMENT.

"O messenger of God! Verily I have done a great crime, is there any act by which I may repent?" The prophet said:

"Have you a mother?" "No," said the questioner. "Have you an aunt?" asked Mohammad. He said, "Yes, I have." Lord Mohammad said, "Go, do good to her, and your crime will be pardoned.

### THE HOLY PROPHET AND HIS NURSE.

I saw Lord Mohammad distributing meat in Jiranah, and behold a woman came close to him and he spread his garments for her to sit upon. When I saw such respect shown to the woman, I asked who she was; and those present said, "She is his nurse."

### GOOD TO PARENTS AFTER INJURY.

A man is bound to do good to his parents, although they may have injured him.

### REWARD OF KIND LOOKS TO PARENTS.

There is no child, a doer of good to his parents, who looketh on them with kindness and affection but God will write for every look as the rewards for an approved pilgrimage.

---

## THE HOLY PROPHET AND HIS FOLLOWERS.

---

THE mighty and powerful magnetism of the Prophet Muhammad (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him!) not only ennobled the souls of his companions so far as to make them bow to the glory of the eternal and living God, instead of images and creatures, and exchange their false religions for the truth concerning God, but at the same time breathed into them the soul which annihilated all their passions for and hankering after the world and its advantages. They saw God and sacrificed their lives in His way with such zeal and resigned themselves so completely to His will that each one of them was an Abraham in his relation towards God. The great and noble deeds, which they did with true sincerity, to declare the glory of the living God and blot out the false dignity of the images from the hearts of men are unparalleled in the history of the world. Their sincerity was blessed by the Lord, and achieved for them such success in the conquest of the countries as even firearms are unable to do. When we consider, on the one hand, the darkness which spread over Arabia and the unbelief and image-worship which disgraced the whole country, and cast a glance, on the other, at the transformed peninsula and its sons, after the companions of the Prophet had done their part in the cause of their benighted countrymen, we are obliged to confess that a new spirit of truth and zeal had been breathed into them.



The holy zeal and sanctity of the Prophet had exercised its saintly influence over them. They shunned every vice and transgression as if they stood in the awful presence of God's Majesty. Their only ambition was to vie with one another in virtue and goodness. History fails to lay its finger on a single instance where a teacher, no matter whatever his claims may be, could exercise such marvellous influence over his followers.

MOHAMAD ALI,  
Editor of the *Review of Religions*, Qadian.

---

## WHO IS NOT A TRUE MUSLIM.

---

### ACCORDING TO AL-KORAN.

---

AN outward act is nothing if unattended with a transformation of the heart. Almighty God sees one's heart and shall deal with him according to its state. Sin is a poison and therefore a Muslim should shun it. Disobedience to God is an abominable death and Muslim should eschew it. He who when he prays, is faint-hearted and does not consider God powerful over everything, except where He Himself has promised to the contrary, is not a true Muslim. He who forsakes not lying and deceit, is not a true Muslim. He who is involved in the greedy love of this world and does not even raise his eye to look to the next, is not a true Muslim. He who does not in practice give a preference to matters of religion over his worldly affairs, is not a true Muslim. He who does not repent of every evil and wickedness, such as drinking wine, gambling, looking to lust, dishonesty, bribery, and every other iniquity, is not a true Muslim. He who is not regular about his five daily prayers, is not a true Muslim. He who is not constantly supplicating before God and praying to Him with humbleness of heart, is not a true Muslim. He who forsakes not the company of the wicked who cast their evil influence over him, is not a true Muslim. He who does not revere his parents, or does not obey them in that which is fair and not against the Holy Quran, or does not care to serve them to his utmost, is not a true Muslim. He who is not kind and gentle towards his wife and her relatives, is not a true Muslim. He who refuses his neighbour the least good in his power, is not a true Muslim. He who forgives not the trespasses of others and harbours revenge, is not a true Muslim. The husband who is false to his wife and wife who is false to her husband, are not Muslims. Every fornicator, transgressor, drunkard, murderer, thief, gambler, usurper, wrong-doer, liar, forger, every dishonest person, everyone given to bribery, every accuser of his brother or sister, is not a true Muslim. Everyone who does not repent of his

wicked deeds, and hates not the congregation of evil-doers, is not a true Muslim.

---

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON ISLAM.

---

OUR notification to reply to anyone desiring information and enlightenment regarding Mohamadanism, which we deem a most delightful duty for us to perform, sometimes invites very entertaining questions. They not only enable us to have an insight into the Occidental mind in matters of religion, but serve to emphasise with full force the necessity of making gigantic efforts to disseminate Islamic literature in the West. Some of the questions, however, are sufficiently interesting to justify our inserting them in these pages with our reply, and we begin the series in our present number. We again invite questions on Islam, which may find place here from time to time. (Without disclosure of the name of the writer.)

*Question :* How to be recognised as a Muslim?

*Answer :* By actions and deeds; by righteous life and virtuous character, accompanied with good and true beliefs also, as from them only actions spring. We do not believe in emblems and signs. Islam is not confined to certain kinds of dress or headgear.

*Question :* Is there any mosque in England?

*Answer :* Yes, there is one in Woking, Surrey, and I say my daily prayers in it, and act in it as an *Imam*. But the whole earth of God is our mosque. A Muslim is not ashamed of his God to require some four-walled building within which to adore and worship Him. We can say our prayers anywhere and everywhere.

*Question :* Is it necessary to say five daily prayers? Is it not cumbersome and likely to interfere with other calls of life?

*Answer :* Yes, we say five prayers daily—morning, noon, afternoon, evening and night time. If prayer may be taken as a sort of nourishment to keep us up spiritually, it would be hardly correct to regard prayer as interfering with our daily life. With our early tea we have got here five meals daily. With a slight alteration I would say my prayer with my meals at one and the same time, one after another. One cannot afford to keep fast for full six days and break it on Sunday. If you worship your *flesh* five times daily, is it inconvenient to minister to the *spirit* as well? We need more spiritual culture than carnal growth. Other creatures besides man also know how to fill their bellies. Man has got something extra in him which requires sustenance as well.

*Question :* May verses from the Holy Quran be worn as charms?



*Answer:* Islam came to uproot all sorts of superstitious beliefs and practices. We never use Quranic verses as charms. We do not believe in charms. Of course the Book has got a charming influence for the human mind in the food which it supplies—mentally and spiritually. We regard it as a blessing of God, to revere it as such, and to keep it with us as such, with a view to act upon its tenets and teachings, is a real charm which works wonders. It makes a man of a brute, and an angel of a man. By observing it man himself becomes the hand of God, and a true image of the Most High. He works wonders and shows signs. He himself becomes THE CHARM.

*(To be continued.)*

---

## WHAT WILL JESUS FIND IF HE COME AGAIN!

---

WERE it possible for Jesus to come again and witness the state of the millions who call themselves the flock of Christ, it would indeed strike him with wonder that the generation of people, who have abandoned themselves to demoralising excesses and resigned themselves to the passions of the flesh, and who are overcharged with the cares of this world, go by his name and claim to follow in his footsteps. It cannot be denied that the fold of Christ to-day is walking in a path different from that in which it walked in the days when the presence of its holy keeper exercised its wholesome influence over it. People have departed from the paths of purity and righteousness, and have taken to licentiousness, intemperance, luxury and bestiality. People who were told to 'take no thought for the morrow,' and 'lay not up treasures upon earth,' hanker after earthly advantage and the amassing of wealth. Thousands of street girls and tens of thousands of women of loose character have sprung up amongst a people whose Book contained the plain injunction "that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." Where are we to seek for that purity and chastity upon which Jesus laid so much stress? Is it in the people among whom the man who commits adultery with an unmarried woman is not deemed guilty of a crime, but if he marries her he is a criminal? Is this the boasted morality of Christianity? Can the pure conscience of a man bear witness that this was the purpose of Jesus' teachings? Were the elect of God and the holy messengers of heaven, whom He appointed to teach truth and purity to generations of men—Abraham, Jacob, Moses and David, who stuck to polygamy to their very death—guilty in the sight of the Lord? Is the wholesale debauchery and excessive drinking of Christian



Europe in accordance with what Jesus taught? Do Christians follow the injunction of their Master, who told them to turn the left cheek when smitten on the right?

R. R.

---

## THE GOSPEL OF HOPE.

---

By PRINCESS KARADJA, Bovigny Castle, Belgium.

---

*(Continued from page 267.)*

---

ACCORDING to this doctrine all those who have lived their lives in sin but seek Christ in the hour of death, in a spirit of true repentance, are considered worthy, without any further preparation, to mix with the angels and of approaching the Lord. On the contrary, those who expire without having received the gift of Grace are proclaimed to be hopelessly lost, no matter how virtuous their earthly life may have been. In other words, we are requested to believe that the God of Justice will allow the guilty to escape his well-deserved punishment if he throws his guilt on the innocent; and that the God of Love will punish the faults of his erring children with endless, hopeless, useless suffering. On one side "believers" are promised entire immunity; on the other, "unbelievers" are denied all justice.

The A B C of justice is that crime and penalty are proportionately weighed. If temporal faults were punished by eternal torment, the judge would be a revengeful not a just God.

What would be the use of the torments of hell if their aim were not the improvement of the sinner? What would be the use of an improvement if there were no hope of a final cessation of the torments?

No one who has ever realised the great influence of sorrow upon spiritual development can possibly doubt the existence of hell; that is to say, a personal hell created by each evil individuality.

It is absolutely necessary for those spirits, who have of their own free will separated themselves from the Trinity—Life, Love, and Light—which is their own origin, to gradually recognise their error, whose inevitable result is suffering. They must learn to use their free will in loving submission to the will of God. They are not kept in hell by His will, but by their own impenitence. They\* have created that hell by their sin and its consequences. So long as they obstinately resist the magnetic attraction of divine love, do they deprive themselves of the

---

\* The fire of the wrath of God (hell) burns on account of the sins which rise above the hearts.—The Quran.—ED.

possibility of regaining their place near the Father, which once they forfeited through transgression of His laws.

It might consequently be possible that hell lasted eternally, but its eternity is certainly not compulsory, even for the greatest sinner. No penitent soul is ever detained there against his will. The doctrine of eternal damnation is an insult to God. He is the very essence of justice and mercy.

No earthly father would be cruel enough to wish to procreate a son if he knew in advance that the eventual destiny of that son would be intense wretchedness. Is it reasonable to attribute to God a cruelty of which man would be incapable? He, who in His mighty knowledge knew the fate of each individual before the creation of the world, cannot have produced beings whose ultimate destiny is inevitable eternal torment.

Some people, who are firmly convinced of their own salvation, will perhaps retort: "Eternal torment is not inevitable. We have a time of grace granted us on earth. It is fair that those who neglect their opportunities burn in hell."

I am afraid that this type of Christian will have some unpleasant surprises after death. It seems to me boundless impertinence for us—grains of dust—to fix limits for the mercy of the Creator.

It is not surprising that the hearts of men fill with despair during their pilgrimage on this planet of sorrow when religion threatens them with eternal fire unless they accept a dogma, in ignorance of which millions of human beings have lived and died, both before and after the birth of Christ.

Is it a good method of education to enforce a child's submission through threats, which compel it to doubt the love and justice of its father? Are threats necessary to lead mankind towards God? Is it not more desirable that a soul should approach in love and thankfulness than in fear and trembling?

It is, indeed, not to be wondered at that so many people feel absolute antipathy towards a God whose loving intentions are so misunderstood, and that they prefer the thought of utter annihilation to every promise of a heaven in His vicinity.

We can best judge what a monstrous conception our ancestors entertained of that blessed abode when we remember that in former days learned preachers proclaimed that the happiness of the angels was increased through the sight of the torments of the damned. This charitable thought does really no credit to its originator.

Nowadays no true Christian would require such a highly spiced felicity. Even here on earth we notice how the sufferings of ailing humanity cast a shadow over the personal happiness of each noble heart. Is it conceivable that we shall after death become callous enough to enjoy an utterly selfish happiness? Heaven would be unendurable without the certainty that all our erring brethren will, sooner or later, be gathered into the many mansions of our Father. It is just the firm conviction of the



ultimate victory of divine love which enables faithful hearts to wait patiently, in hopeful peace, for the arrival of the repenting sinners, who finally will join them in the universal home. The possibility of helping struggling souls upwards is surely one of the purest joys of the angels. Christ has said: "There is joy in heaven over every sinner that repenteth."

Instead of classifying mankind under the heads of "Good" and "Bad," or "Believers" and "Unbelievers," it would be better to divide them into "happy" beings who perceive light, and strive to ascend towards it—and into "unhappy" creatures who are still in the darkness. Such a division seems to me more in accord with the spirit of charity, which ought to animate the Christian community, than the present classification. He who said: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," and "Judge not, that ye may not be judged," would surely disapprove of the intolerance which causes a number of people who call themselves "saved" to close the gates of heaven to all those who do not share their religious idiosyncracies.

God has expressly promised that the smoking flax shall not be quenched—but such would be the case if all those who have wandered blindly in darkness and sin without perceiving the light—should not subsequently—with the assistance of divine love—have an opportunity afforded them of struggling upwards to higher spheres. Our short life on earth is surely not the only occasion granted us for battle and progression.

Although this life does not altogether decide our fate, the use we make of it is naturally of enormous importance. Even if sin has not the power of definitely preventing our arrival at our heavenly goal, it certainly greatly retards our ascension.

One might possibly argue that if the dogma of eternal hell were eliminated from religion, then mankind would make a still worse use of the time of grace which is granted him on earth. Such would not be the case if everyone clearly grasped that each selfish act, each uncharitable word, each evil thought is recorded against our spiritual balance-sheet, and will be an inexhaustible source of suffering till each debt is paid—to the last jot. Everyone absolutely convinced of this fact would naturally seek to avoid incurring heavy moral debts.

In many places in the Scriptures, the justice of God and the inevitable consequences of sin are clearly pointed out: "An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth." "Thou shalt reap as thou hast sown," "He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity"; "He that killeth with a sword must be killed with a sword." These words are very clear. Unfortunately they have been deprived of all signification by the undue accentuation of the doctrine that whoever casts his sins on Christ escapes all punishment, and will not after death have to endure the consequences of all the crimes he has committed on earth.

Two of God's attributes, Charity and Justice, would be antagonistical if this view of the redemption were correct. A

similar dogma has a demoralising effect, because it undermines the sense of personal responsibility, which is engraved even in the conscience of the savage.

We have every reason to believe that God pardons us for Christ's sake all the sins of which we truly repent; but it is impossible that this pardon should imply that we escape the payment of our debts to our neighbours. True repentance is always characterised by a keen desire to make reparation for the evil we have done. Each remorseful spirit, who has implored and received the pardon of God, is prompted not by any outside agency, but by a deep instinct to seek the pardon of his injured brother, because his conscience will not allow him perfect peace until this is done.

It is perfectly conceivable that a gracious God† pardons crimes committed against Himself, but it is absolutely inconceivable that a just God should efface crimes committed towards others, as by acting thus He would infringe upon the rights of the creditor, who alone is entitled to absolve the debt. If an earthly father had two sons, and one illtreated the other, it is obvious that the father would not grant him pardon until the guilty one had offered his brother full compensation. If the criminal refused to grant the indemnification claimed, it is evident that his so-called repentance was not an expression of heartfelt contrition, but merely a cowardly attempt to escape a well-deserved punishment. Is it probable that Christ died on the cross to enable us successfully to defraud our neighbour? This would be the case if our unpaid debts were obliterated without the consent of our moral creditors. Such a proceeding would be contrary to all notions of human justice. Can we suppose that God's justice is less perfect than our own?

The words of Christ: "Before thou layest thy gift upon the altar, first go and be reconciled unto thy brother," demonstrates clearly that a personal reparation is demanded. Christ repeatedly insists upon the necessity of seeking and according pardon. This would be entirely superfluous if every sin was effaced by faith.

One might retort: "If faith alone is not sufficient to grant beatitude, you diminish the merit of Christ's salvation work." The best reply to this insinuation is the following question: "Is it probable that Christ himself would wish to add to his merits at the expense of justice?"

For my part, I consider the immense spiritual wealth of Christ sufficient without such an addition.

He gives us full opportunity to indemnify our injured fellow-creatures: is not this a greater benefaction than any arbitrary remission of our debts? If an honest man finds himself unable to meet his engagements, would he not be more grateful if he

---

† The Muslim belief is the same.—ED.



were put in a position to satisfy each claim, instead of being allowed to shirk his duties?

The Lutheran dogma, which declares that the blood of Christ grants absolute immunity to all "believers," is simply monstrous, as every debt towards our neighbour must be paid, even if each debt towards God is remitted.

The thought that each one has inevitably to endure the consequence of his acts is naturally very disagreeable to all those who cherish the belief that all their sins are obliterated, and have consequently lost all power to interfere with the perfect bliss which they hope to enjoy immediately after death.

Most people imagine that one "goes to heaven" by being suddenly transported into the midst of dazzling splendour, however little suited the soul may be to such unfamiliar surroundings.

Such an interpretation is most erroneous. By reason of the law of harmony, which is revealed throughout the universe, each spirit is attracted to its own element after the change, called Death—that is to say, he is drawn by magnetic force towards the environments which are most in tune with his own nature. He would find himself most uncomfortable in any other atmosphere; a discordant note would at once be produced.

This fact cannot be doubted by anyone who has remarked how awkward and ill at ease a coarse and vulgar person appears if by chance he finds himself in refined society. The presence of a single individual of that kind is sufficient to cast a chill upon the most cheerful gathering.

No created being can be happy out of its element: a fish upon a sunny lawn would not appreciate the charms of his new surroundings, even if one tried to persuade him that his status had been considerably improved.

Such would be the case with us. Poor, sinful beings as we are, we would not be happy in the company of angels, even if we were permitted to sully their abode with our presence immediately after our death. At the sight of the glittering white raiment of the angels, which is never tarnished by any impure thought, we should look down with deep shame upon our soiled garments. Even the soul of a good man is daily tainted by shady thoughts. Here on earth their dinginess can be hidden, but in the radiance above all is revealed. We would perish with shame if we were suddenly transported in our present state of degradation straight into the Realm of Glory; its splendour would be intolerable to our feeble spiritual eyes.

Many people imagine that death brings about a complete metamorphosis. This is a total error. The liberation of the soul from its physical cover is an event of minor importance in the existence of an immortal being. It does not cause the slightest modification in his spiritual condition. No miraculous change transforms suddenly a man into an angel or a devil. Heavenly bliss is not obtained at a bound, and still less is anyone precipitated into the abyss of irredeemable wickedness.

Man retains absolutely the same individuality which he possessed before this incarnation. He brings with him into the Spirit world all the characteristics which denoted his personality on earth. If all his weaknesses and evil instincts were instantly blotted out, so that he became an angel, or if every good feeling were suddenly extinguished, so that he was transformed into a demon—then such a metamorphosis would constitute the complete annihilation of his personality. He would no longer be himself, but another being.

All similar abrupt changes are contrary to the laws of nature, which govern the invisible as well as the visible universe.† No violent revolution transforms the heart of winter into glowing midsummer. We are at first allowed to enjoy the sweet promises of spring. An infinity of delicate shadings marks the passage from one colour to another. Who would like to wipe out the rainbow tints of nature and feel happy in a world of black and white?

The brilliant sunlight dispels not instantly midnight darkness. Dawn breaks gently, so that the eye may not be dazzled by too sudden a radiance. After long years of earthly darkness our spiritual eye is not able to bear the intense lustre of Divine Glory. Only an ever increasing effulgence tells the quivering soul that he is approaching his Creator.

This knowledge fills him with exquisite joy. It spurs him on to fresh efforts, and each new progress brings its own reward in the form of keener delights. As these pleasures are in direct proportion to the moral status of the soul, it is obvious that each improvement results in an augmented capacity for enjoyment.

As the spirit develops, the more glory it is capable of seeing, hearing, feeling, and understanding, because its perceptive powers have increased.

Here below we can notice how higher education procures higher joys. Observe two people—one musical, the other not—listening to the same harmony; that which transports the one with joy, leaves the other indifferent. To an uneducated person a world of esthetic and intellectual pleasures remains closed.

No universal form of happiness could satisfy all mankind, because their conception of “bliss” varies infinitely. Consequently it is evident that myriads of different souls cannot enter the same heaven to enjoy through all eternity the *same* degree of stationary felicity. Such a heaven would be distinctly unpleasant. How can one accept verbally the allegorical promise to “sit eternally upon thrones, with palms in hands”? A more wearisome prospect can hardly be imagined. To sit upon a throne would cease to be a privilege if everybody enjoyed the same advantage.

---

† According to the Quran both heaven and hell are places for the perpetual advancement of man to higher and higher stages. It says on one occasion: “Verily you shall all be surely transferred from state to state.”—lxxiv. 19.



## SPECIAL FEATURES OF ISLAM.

---

*A Paper read by KHWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN, of the "ISLAMIC REVIEW," at the SIXTH CONGRESS OF RELIGIONS, in PARIS, on July 19, 1913.*

---

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—

Allow me, once more, to express my sincere thanks for the privilege and the honour you have conferred upon me to say here a few words on behalf of my religion. That Islam admittedly was the torch-bearer of learning and light in the West in days when Europe was enshrouded in ignorance and darkness, and that the followers of the Holy Prophet were undoubtedly among the very few factors in creating the conditions which led to the present culture and advancement here, are in themselves cogent reasons which should strongly appeal to your sense of duty and justice towards Islam and the Mussalmans. What a pity that with all the outpouring of learning and literature, no proper efforts are made to clear off that cloud of misrepresentation and want of knowledge which still envelopes the religion of Arabia in the West. You can afford, ladies and gentlemen, to explore dead and dull regions of Antarctic oceans at the expense of inestimable human lives and resources, but you do not care to fathom that great religious ocean which deeply affects physical, moral and spiritual regions of a vast number of humanity. It is a happy sign, however, to find plans of Universal Religion discussed in your programme, and a desire to create a better understanding amongst the adherents of the various denominations and persuasions of the world; but in order to find out a *via media* between different religions, and to create harmony among the conflicting elements in religious opinion, is it not necessary that first-hand information should be obtained at least of a religion, which at present is a living force and a co-worker with other factors in humanising millions of men still living on the planes of ignorance and barbarity? It is absolutely inconsistent with your advanced culture that your information on Islam should come through adulterated channels and from the hands of propagandists hostile to Islam; and in this respect, ladies and gentlemen, allow me to assure you that *misconception*, *misconstruction*, or even *misinterpretation* of Islam and its tenets is not our complaint, it is

### MISREPRESENTATION AND MISINFORMATION,

by which we are the chief sufferers here. Things having no existence whatsoever in our teachings and polity have been

imputed to us, and baseless charges advanced against Islam ; nay, the very beauties which we account amongst our exclusive possessions have been denied to us, and the very evils which Islam came to eradicate, and did succeed in so doing, are ascribed to it. Do not monotheistic ideas pervade all your deliberations to-day in this Liberal Congress, and is not, therefore, your everlasting gratitude due to the religion which alone in the most unequivocal way taught the Unity of God and the Equality of Man !

The shortness of the time at my disposal, Ladies and Gentlemen, disables me from giving you even a bird's-eye view of my religion, but availing myself of the courtesy awarded to me, allow me to give you a few features of Islam which, to my mind, as a student of religion for the last twenty years, appeal as its special and exclusive acquisitions.

#### MUSLIM ATTITUDE TOWARDS OTHER RELIGIONS.

The very first word in the book of Islam inculcates the most generous views which a Muslim must entertain towards the other religions of the world. Almost all pre-Islamic religions, while claiming Divine revelation for their origin, denied that privilege to the others, as if the adherents of the latter were the step-children of God, or the Universal Father forgot them after they were created. This narrow-mindedness created contempt and hatred between nations and nations, and caused disintegration among the various members of God's family, resulting in wars and fighting, which devastated everything noble and high in humanity. But Islam uprooted this very idea ; it taught that every\* nation had been blessed with a teacher from God. The Divine origin of every religion was admitted, and subsequent innovations by man, if any were pointed out. "*All praise and glory is due to Allah (God), who is Creator, Sustainer and Nourisher of all the races of mankind,*" are the opening words of the Quran. Is not physical sustenance open to every man, white or black ; why not, then, spiritual ? If the various components of Nature have been created to meet equally the physical needs of all the nations of the world, nourishment of soul is equally needed. And therefore the Final Word of God in the Quran declared that all the prophets of various nations of the world came from God, and brought light from one Divine source. Nay, Islam did not assume and claim a new position for itself† as a religion. It came to complete that old, old religion :

#### THE GOSPEL OF OBEDIENCE TO DIVINE LAWS,

---

\* "And to every people have we sent an apostle, saying : 'Worship God and turn away from Satan.'"—The Quran 16 : 38. "Every people hath its guide."—The Quran 13 : 8. "Nor hath there been a people unvisited by its warner."—The Quran 35 : 21.

† "To-day, I (God) have completed the faith."—The Quran.



which was gradually revealed to the blessed race of the prophets from Adam to Jesus. As the Quran says in this respect :—

*"Say (ye Muslims) : We believe in God, and what has been sent down to us (through the Holy Prophet), and what has been sent to Abraham and Ismael and Isaac, and Jacob, and the tribes, and in what was given to Moses, and Jesus, and the Prophet, from their Lord. We make no difference between them, and to Him are we resigned."*—The Quran II. 88.

This verse not only makes a Muslim a follower of the Holy Prophet Mohammad, but infuses in him a spirit of allegiance and reverence to Moses, Jesus and all other prophets of the world. The Quran is his sacred book, no doubt, but the sacred scriptures of other nations are also his common property with them.

#### RELIGION A PRACTICAL LIFE.

The second special feature which I claim for Islam is the different conception of religion which it presents to its followers. Islam does not believe in rituals and ceremonials as essentials in religion, nor does it inculcate any dogma or sacrament. It is neither monasticism nor absolute prudentialism. It makes religion a simple, practical life. In every deed and action, and in every thought and conception, a Musalman has to observe his religion. Hence Islam provides various laws and regulations for observance in one's life. And does not our daily life exert deep influence upon our soul and morals? One who regards spirituality as something different from what may be called AN OUTCOME OF BALANCED MORALS AND PASSIONS has hardly understood human nature.† Hence the Muslim's spirituality does not begin to work when he goes into the four walls of his sanctuary, nor has he to wait for certain periods of time in a week or a month for the edification of his soul. Everything, even of the least magnitude and intensity, whether good or bad, he has been taught has a deep effect§ upon his life in every respect, and he stands responsible for it before God, who is believed to be Omnipresent and Omniscient. The Holy Prophet Mohammad, when questioned, defined Islam in one word. Islam, he said, consists in

#### OBEDIENCE TO GOD AND BENEVOLENCE TO HIS CREATURES,

A religion which alone, in my humble judgment, can be and ought to be the coming religion of the world. No doubt Islam also teaches certain beliefs and enjoins certain practices, but lest they may be confused with what constitutes real religion, they have been named Pillars of Islam and not Islam in themselves ;

† We intend to discuss this subject later on.—ED.

§ "And whosoever shall have wrought an atom's weight of good shall behold it. And whosoever shall have wrought an atom's weight of evil shall behold it."—The Quran 99 : 7, 8.

but they are indispensable, as beliefs lead to human actions and practice makes man perfect. That *rituals are of little value, if unattended with virtuous actions and good beliefs*, has been elucidated in the following verse from the Quran :—

*“ There is no piety in turning your face towards the East or the West, but he is pious who believeth in God and the last day, and the angels, and the scriptures, and the prophets; who for the love of God disburseth his wealth to his kindred and to the orphans, and the needy, and the wayfarer, and those who ask, and for ransoming; who observeth prayer, and payeth the legal alms, and who is of those who are faithful to their engagements when they have engaged in them, and patient under ills and hardships, and in time of trouble; these are they who are just and these are they who fear the Lord.”—The*

*Quran, II., 171.*

#### THE ISLAMIC NOTION OF WORSHIP.

And it would not be out of place to give here the Islamic notion of the worship of God and His glorification, which has been considered to be the main object of religion in the world. Under the teachings of Islam GOD IS MUCH TOO GREAT TO BE PLEASED IN SEEING MAN BOW DOWN AT HIS ALTAR.|| Man's submission or disobedience to Him, according to the Quran, neither adds to nor subtracts from His Divine glory, as God is self-sufficient. Edification of God under Islam consists in edification of man. Similarly glorification of God simply means regeneration of man. The very word *Ibâdat*, which in the Arabic texts stands for worship and adoration to God, is very suggestive. Literally it also means to open and work out what is latent in one. To convert our high and noble potentialities into actualities is therefore the chief object of our *Ibâdat*—i.e., worship; but to do so we need certain laws and regulations revealed to us by Him who is the creator of all our faculties. Thus, in the second place, worship of God comes to mean obedience to such laws and regulations. Again, certain beliefs and practices are necessary to create in one a disposition to obey and submit, in order to make him observant of Divine commandments which are conducive to his final regeneration. Thus in common parlance saying prayers, fasting, and doing other things, come to mean worship. Otherwise real worship and true glorification of God are simply meant to

---

|| “Thou shalt warn those who fear their Lord in secret, and observe prayer. And whoever shall keep himself pure, he purifieth himself to his own behoof.”—The Quran 35: 19.

“Be thankful to God: for whoever is thankful, is thankful to his own behoof; and if any shall be thankless . . . God truly is self-sufficient, worthy of all praise.”—The Quran 31: 11.



cause edification and evolving of man.† One who fails to edify himself, has failed to realise the object of worship. Similarly, if Islam lays special stress on the unity of God and destroys all polytheistic tendencies in man, it is not to satisfy a certain passion of

### JEALOUSY IN GOD,

who cannot suffer to see any other deity on the same altar with Him. It is in order to accept one and the only one source of the law, that the unity of God is so emphatically preached in Islam. God, the creator of our faculties as well as the author of all other things in the Universe created to help human development, can alone know and show us the way of our evolution and give the law. But if I\* have got more than one god to worship, my sense of obedience to His law must suffer. Hence to believe in one and the only one God is essential for the proper growth and moulding of my real character. Besides, the very idea of the unity of God establishes two things which are the only basis of all our civilisation and culture: the equality of man and the subservience of Nature. The first opens chances of progress equally to every one, and the other leads to all scientific researches; and the Quran in explicit terms mentions these two things as the necessary fruits of our belief in the unity of God.

### ISLAM PROVIDES A COMPLETE CODE OF LIFE.

If religion or the worship of God is therefore so closely connected with our own regeneration, are we not in need of laws and regulations to guide us? Our physical conditions produce a deep effect upon our morals, which when exercised with high character work out our spirituality. Our ethics and polity have also to play a great part in our spiritual growth. Besides, we are subject to our environments. Those surrounding us affect us, and are in their turn affected by us. We cannot do without them; thus we need a complete code of laws regulating our *interse* relations, suiting all our walks of life, and helping us in all our endeavours. Without such training and regulation the attainment of spirituality is impossible. Those who speak of it, independent of all our social and communal bonds, hardly understand the signification of their own utterances.

It is, however, to meet this natural demand that Islam has another special feature. It provides rules and laws suiting all conditions of humanity. Man in every position and capacity finds something in the Quran to guide him. Religion is not the monopoly of one class or section of humanity; and men differ from each other in degree of culture and taste. Those who live in Central Africa are poles apart intellectually,

---

† "Believers, bow down and prostrate yourselves and worship your Lord and work righteousness that you may become evolved."—The Quran 22 : 76.

\* "*Had there been in either heaven or earth gods besides God, there would have been confusion in them both.*"—The Quran 21 : 22.

morally and socially from those in Europe. But Islam claims to furnish rules and regulations for them all. If it gives ordinary and initial laws of sociality to Central Africa to improve their physical conditions and improve their social relations, it teaches sublime morals and high spirituality to men of advancement and culture, and brings them to that highest goal of human soaring which brings man into union with God. It is in this connection that Islam teaches

### THE SINLESSNESS OF MAN.

It does not believe in the inheritance of sin. Sin, according to Islam, is not in man's nature, but an individual's acquisition after his birth. We are therefore named *Muslim*—i.e., obedient to the law. And what is sin? Simply disobedience. Hence one who is a true Muslim is sinless. Sin is an acquired thing, and can be purged off. I am surely a Son of God, and the beginning words of the Lord's Prayer teach me to believe so. I may become a prodigal, but I can claim my heritage, and become His 'begotten'; and how can I be in union with God if sin is my nature; if I cannot be free from it, to be at one with the Great Sinless is an uncompassable thing? It is in this respect that the Book of Islam conferred the highest boon on the human race. It was to create in man the consciousness of possessing the highest capabilities, and to open before his eyes a prospect of unlimited progress.

The holy words of our Book in this respect are as follows:—

"Verily we (God) created man with the best fabric, endowed him with the best faculties, then brought him down to be the lowest of the low (i.e., he is also prone to go to the lowest ebb), save those who believe in truths and do the things that are right, theirs is the unlimited reward."—The

Quran 95 : 3, 4, 5.

Is not this very idea, that man is equipped with the highest capabilities and can make unlimited progress, the chief attraction and pride of Rationalism? "This† idea of continued and uninterrupted development is one that seems absolutely to override our age. It is scarcely possible to open any really able book on any subject without encountering it in some form. It is stirring all science to its very depths; it is revolutionising all historical literature." But who should claim the credit of bringing out this golden rule of advancement into the world? In most clear terms it has been existing in the Quran for the last 1,300 years, while Rationalism is admittedly of modern growth. Nay, the text in the Quran is in a much improved form, giving us a complete insight into every phase of human nature.

---

† "History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe." By Lecky. Edition 1910, p. 168.



We no doubt are equipped with the best faculties, but we are not free from reactionery elements in our nature. Potentialities do exist on both sides. We have a bright as well as a dark side of our character. "We created man," the God of the Quran says, "with the best fabric, but we also bring him down to be the lowest of low, if he fails to observe good laws, and do right things." What a truism! and we observe it in our daily life. Men equally circumstanced and born with equal environments, run different ways in their course of life: one ascends to the top of the ladder and the other lies at the bottom. Scrutinize their modes of life, and the truth revealed in the Quranic words comes home to us. One accepted the right path, and the other fell into error and went astray. Rationalism gives us only an energising factor, but the Book of God adds to it the necessary check and caution. The latter gives us a perfect code, while the former takes a partial view. In order to keep this golden rule of life always before our eyes, we have been taught to repeat the following in the concluding portion of our daily prayer, which may be said to be the analogue of the Lord's Prayer with us Muslims:—

"Guide us, O Lord, into the right path which leads us to Thee, and let it be so that, remaining firm in that path, we may be guided to walk in the footsteps of persons upon whom have been Thy blessings and favours. Save us, O God, from the path of the people upon whom has been Thy wrath, and of those who, having fallen into *errors*, have gone *astray* and not reached Thee. Be it so, O God."

Those who tread the right path and remain firm in it, "continued and uninterrupted" development comes to them; all their noble and high potentialities become actualities, and these are the Blessings of God, but those who *fall into error* and go *astray*, they become "the lowest of the low," which in the Book of Islam has been named as the 'Wrath of God.' The words "Thy blessings and favours" are worthy of note. They have the widest signification and encompass everything good and noble; everything necessary and desirable. The words speak of themselves and do not require any explanation. But I would say one word about that highest blessing which God conferred on man, a Divine gift which, according to the Quran, is open to all mankind. It is

#### TO BE AT ONE WITH GOD,

and to be in union with Him; to talk to, and to be talked to by, Him. And this is not an *impossibility*. The Divine Attributes have never been and cannot be in abeyance. If God spoke to man in days gone by, it is blasphemy even to think that He has become dumb now. On the other hand, if man has once shown the capability of being spoken to by the Most High in ancient

days, we have not lost any of the faculties we inherited from Adam.

If the world in its material progress can produce every now and then, say, Newtons, Herschells, and Addisons, where lies the impossibility of seeing Jesuses, Krishnas, and Budhas again? Are we not endowed with the same constitutions; and does not physical equality demand spiritual equality? That it is possible, we find in the Quran. Nay, we have been given similar promises elsewhere. Did not Jesus, as well as Krishna and Budha, promise their re-appearances? Jesus also explains how this re-appearance will take place. It is not the coming of the former man, but the appearance of the new with the spiritual semblance of the old. If †John the Baptist was Elias, and we should accept the words of Jesus to be true, the re-appearance of these great men will be in the same way. Therefore, when I pray to God that I may be shown the path, by treading which I may attain what was given to those blessed by Him, it is not kingship or commandership, or any other high worldly position, that I pray for. That is not my ambition. These are ordinary human achievements. A Muslim claims the heritage of the Prophet. The words "Guide us into the right path" in the Muslim prayer are very instructive. We do not beg him to "give" us something, but to guide us; we invoke guidance, and if our prayers meet his acceptance, we are sure to receive inspiration or Divine revelation according to our deserts.

#### THE TEACHINGS OF ISLAM BASED ON RATIONALITY.

Another special feature of Islam is the rational basis on which it explains all the truths it inculcates. What makes the hold of religion looser and looser on the modern mind? There is a great dearth of such bases. Every religion demands its adherent to believe in certain things as truths—Godhood, angels, revelation, prophethood, the day of judgment, the resurrection, life after death, and our reaping the fruits of our actions in that life, which means heaven or hell. These are the various things taken as truths, and preached in different forms by different religions. We may diverge in our conception of them, but we converge on basic lines. But do we not possess reason? Has not God equipped us with various faculties, and has not His Providence supplied us with means to satisfy their respective cravings? I have feelings, I have passions, but I have also reason. If the cravings of my heart can be satisfied, why curb the demands of my reason? If you gratify my emotional side, why thwart me on my rational side?

The above-mentioned articles of faith have been taught by almost all religions as postulates and axioms; but how to make them acceptable to a sceptic mind? In the Quran, however, everything has been explained on a logical basis,

---

† Matt. xi. 14, 17, 12; Mark ix. 12, 13.



and cogent reasons given in proof, with apt illustrations from Nature. Besides, the complete Word of God should not need the advocacy of its followers. Let not the preacher, but the Book itself, explain to me my difficulties. The Book of Islam, however, not only appeals to heart, feelings and sentiments, but also to the mind and reason. The former Scriptures, though of the same Divine origin with the Quran, could not do so, as the people immediately concerned lacked the intellectual development to appreciate truths explained on a rational basis. Jesus had to speak all the things "§in parables, and without a parable spake he not unto them," because they were "||without understanding."

#### THE ETHICS OF ISLAM.

Another improvement which the Book of Islam has made on the previous ethical writings of the world is the distinction between the natural qualities of man and his moral conditions. We are equipped with various passions and qualities—such as affection, meekness, mercy, humility, and so forth. But, according to the Quran, they do not fall under the heading of moral conditions, unless they are guided by the dictates of reason and conscience. They are mere natural and instinctive impulses. For instance, ¶the affection and docility which a dog or a goat, or any other domestic animal, shows towards its master cannot be designated as courtesy or refined manners, nor can the fierceness of a wolf or a lion be classed as rudeness or misbehaviour. "Mere possession of a few qualities which are the outcome of natural impulses does not bring about spiritual life. For instance, meekness of heart, peace of mind, and avoidance of mischief are only so many natural qualities, and may be possessed even by an unworthy person who is quite ignorant of the true fountain of salvation. Not a few animals are quite harmless and more sinned against than sinning. When tamed they are not offensive in the least, and being lashed they do not resist. Yet, notwithstanding all this, no one can have the foolishness to call them man—much less as good as man." A goat is more meek of heart than many a man. Similarly, persons guilty of the blackest deeds sometimes manifest qualities worthy of advanced morality. Robin Hood must rob the rich to feed the poor. Europe, with all her love for dogs and mercy for dumb animals, did not find her humanitarian sense injured by the recent slaughter and strangulation of the various Muslim races. Thus a teacher who reads to us homilies on morals approving certain qualities and belittling others, simply appeals to our natural impulses, which still need moderation and restraint. It is another special feature of Islam that its Holy Book made a distinction between our instinctive cravings and high morals. It did not give us only a list of moral qualities, but

---

§ Matt. xiii. 34.

|| Matt. xv. 16.

¶ "Teachings of Islam." By Hazret Mirza Shulam Ahmad of Qadian. (Blessed be his soul !)

showed us the occasion of their use. Do not our actions change in their results with the change of scene and environment? Does not the same action become virtue and evil under diverse conditions? To punish a culprit is simply to show mercy to society. The peace of a community would suffer seriously if at the trial of an offender the magistrate acted according to the wish of the offender. In connection with this I may point out another common mistake of the so-called moralists. The tender qualities, in their opinion, exhaust the whole list of morals, as if our Creator was unwise in endowing us with certain stern qualities—such as anger, vengeance, and jealousy. They should know that it is vengeance which, when properly administered by the magistrate, guarantees protection of life and property and becomes a necessary virtue. Jealousy or envy, used on a proper occasion, creates in us high aspirations and actuates us to achieve excellence. To curb these natural propensities is no morality, it is their balanced condition which makes them indispensable national virtues. Hence the Quran does not simply say that charity, courage, justice, mercy, kindness, truth, high-mindedness are high excellent morals, but it shows that all the other qualities with which man's mind is endowed—such as politeness, modesty, honesty, generosity, jealousy, perseverance, chastity, anger, devoutness, moderation, compassion, sympathy, courage, forgiveness, vengeance, patience, fidelity, &c.—become virtues when they are manifested on their proper occasion. The Holy Book makes mention of all of them, defines their occasions, and shows their right use. It teaches us also the means to be adopted for perfecting these high morals.\* It may be said here also that as, under the teachings of the Quran, our natural impulses when balanced and properly regulated, are converted into moral qualities, “similarly† no hard-and-fast lines can be drawn between the spheres of the moral and the spiritual states.” All our conditions—physical, moral, and spiritual—are interwoven and affect each other. No one can achieve a high stage of spirituality without training his physical conditions and moral qualities, hence the necessity of observing the various laws and regulations given in the Quran concerning our daily life. The subject requires complete elucidation, and the time hardly allows it.

#### WOMAN IN ISLAM.

I am afraid I have already trespassed much upon your courtesy and patience. One word more, and I will conclude my paper. It is the raising of the status of woman that Islam claims as amongst its chief merits. Woman was given a position by Islam which she never enjoyed before. She had no distinct individuality until then. Islam came to give her personal rights. Nay, I would go further, and say that the

---

\* We intend to deal with this subject at length in our subsequent issues.  
—ED.

† The Teachings of Islam.



most cultured nations of the present day have still to make strides to reach that state of civilisation which in the words† of the Quran would say :—

“Women have similar rights to men, the same is due from them (women) as to them.”

If she is under certain duties and obligations towards man, he also is under similar obligations and duties towards her. Thus Islam nearly restores equality between man and woman. It opens to her equal possibilities with man of intellectual, moral and spiritual progress. It gives her a separate and distinct individuality, and raises her from the debasement to which she had been reduced by wrong beliefs, and dogmatic tenets based on ignorance.

---

## MOHAMMADANISM AND CHRISTIANITY AT THE OLD BAILEY.

---

“The religion of the world which has done most to elevate the position of woman is Christianity; the religion of the world which has done most to repress woman is Mohammadanism. Christianity, in all its earliest and purest days, and Christianity during the last great revival of the last eighty years, had been a religion which had never advocated, but which had always repressed, acts of outrage and lawlessness. Mohammadanism was a religion which had been promulgated by the sword.”\*

IN summing up the suffragette trial at the Old Bailey, which ended on June 17 last, Mr. Justice Phillimore was pleased to say something of Islam and Christianity in the words quoted above. We watched the case carefully, and we know for certain that it dealt purely with a conspiracy to use explosive materials to commit damage by the suffragettes, contrary to the Malicious Damage to Property Act of 1861. It involved no question for the judge to decide, as to the respective rights of women under Islam and Christianity. Nor was there any occasion for the presiding officer at the trial to make an invidious comparison between Islam and the religion he professes; and one absolutely fails to find the justification and propriety of the above remark. Justice Phillimore is an ornament of the English Bench, and he may have followed some ancient practice of the English Courts, in introducing extraneous matters into a judicial record by speaking ill of others, and condemning parties unheard. But such a *nice* practice, we candidly admit, has always been unknown to us, with all the knowledge and

---

† The Quran 2 : 228.

\* “Pioneer,” India, July 7.

experience of the writer of these pages as a lawyer. We know that, of late, a *campaign of terror* has been launched within certain quarters here against all matrimonial alliances between white girls and brown men, and to counteract the physical charms of the latter for the former, all sorts of horror-inspiring, silly stories are invented by those who think that such mixed marriages lower European prestige in India. It is also not unknown to us that certain politicians here spare no pains nowadays to depreciate our religion and race, in order to create public opinion to give countenance to all those inhuman "acts of outrage and lawlessness" which, to enlighten Mr. Justice Phillimore, we are constrained to say have been recently perpetrated in Muslim lands by Christians, in repetition of what they used to do before, to quote Phillimore, "the last great revival of the last eighty years," and which have been the special feature of Europeanised Christianity in all its earliest and purest days. However, one is quite justified in holding any opinion he likes on the subject, but we are sure that Mr. Justice Phillimore cannot afford to make the Bench of the King a channel for disseminating views on questions of polity and exigency; nor can it be degraded into a pulpit for a missionary propaganda. It must be by an oversight that the judge made this mistake, because we fail to find any justification whatsoever for the irrelevant remark in question, especially when we consider the merits of the case under trial; and we hope, therefore, that the learned judge of the Old Bailey will *suo motu* exercise his power of review and will order that these *unwarranted and unnecessary words* be expunged from the public judicial record, and will save us the trouble of taking any other suitable step to get the grievance redressed. The Bench, besides, is a public Bench and belongs to an Empire which counts more Muslims than Christians in its realm and cannot be used to our detriment. We take it as an uncalled-for attack on our sacred religion. We also challenge the correctness of the statement. Mr. Justice Phillimore may have believed so, and we are really sorry for England to find such paucity of knowledge in a representative of the King on his Bench as to the religion, the history of the race, which is so conspicuous under the English rule. The learned judge has not only shown his utter want of knowledge of Islam, but he seems never to have cared to study his own religion and its history.

Will Mr. Justice Phillimore kindly say what authorises him to proclaim that Christianity has done most to elevate the position of woman? The New Testament is the only fountain-head of Christian lore; and there we find two religions—one taught by Jesus, and the other by St. Paul. We approach Jesus with all reverence, and we have been taught by Islam to accept Him as one of our prophets. Though His attitude towards the weaker sex was all through sympathetic, it is a matter of great regret that the short and curtailed ministry of the Lord did not



leave Him time to improve the condition of woman in which He found her, and Mr. Justice Phillimore, therefore, will fail to find any authority in the holy sayings of Christ to substantiate his remark. But if he resorts to St. Paul and the writings of the Church, he will find his case worse. He should know that the sole cause of female debasement in Christendom is the very doctrine on which St. Paul constructed the faith of the religion he preached—*i.e.*, Atonement of Sin through the Grace of Blood. Sin is the corner-stone of the Christian religion. It entered into the world, as the Christian belief goes, through woman. She was the first transgressor and tempter of man. Through her came death and eternal perdition—the wages of sin. “Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was the transgressor,” was said by St. Paul. “Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection, for I suffer not a woman to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence,” was another verdict passed by the Apostle to the Gentiles sufficient “*to repress women most*” for ever. “Neither was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man,” we read again in the 1st Corinthians. This estimation of woman can hardly lead her to any elevation. That she was degraded to the utmost debasement by such teachings will appear from the pious aspersions with which woman was blessed every now and then in the whole Mediæval Church. We give a few of them in the footnote† for the enlightenment of Mr. Justice Phillimore.

It cannot be ascribed to the narrow-mindedness of the Middle Age Divines. Their judgment is quite consistent with the doctrine on which Church Christianity has been based. Let Mr. Justice Phillimore make his own judgment of the case. If he believes that the death of Christ was to atone for sin which admittedly came through woman, is Tertullian wrong when he exclaims as follows? :—

*“Do you not know that you are each an Eve? The sentence of God on this sex of yours lives in this age; the guilt must of necessity live too. You are the devil’s gateway; you are the unsealer of that tree; you are the first deserter of the Divine law; you are she who persuaded him whom the devil was not valiant enough to attack. You destroyed so easily God’s image—Man. On account of your deserts—that is, death—even the Son of God had to die.”*

Tertullian may be excused on account of the age he belonged to, if he is so passionate in ventilating his grief for the eternal

---

† “The organ of the devil”—“the foundation of the arms of the devil”—“a scorpion ever ready to sting”—“the gate of the devil, and the road of iniquity”—“the poison of an asp, the malice of a dragon”—“the instrument which the devil uses to gain possession of our souls”—are the names which St. Bernard, St. Antony, St. Bonaventure, St. Jerome, St. Gregory the Great, and St. Cyprian, conferred on the female sex.

perdition which befell man through woman ; but he expressed what everyone will find lurking in his mind if he ever analyses the doctrine of Atonement.

Can any elevation accrue to woman under such wrong beliefs, which, in fact, were never taught by Jesus? This is what Christianity in its received form has done for woman. In fact, Pagan Europe was much more chivalrous to woman than Christian Europe. How can the suffragette movement easily find support from a nation that unfortunately took some Biblical texts as the basis of its legislation? "I cannot suffer woman to usurp the authority of man," and "thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee," are not texts favourable to female emancipation. The present female condition, Mr. Justice Phillimore should know, is not the work of the religion in Europe. Various factors worked it out, and Islam was the chief among them.

We hope that Mr. Justice Phillimore, as an impartial judge at the Old Bailey, will not hesitate to change his opinion on reading what we quote for his benefit from the Mohammadan Scriptures. He has simply to refer to the status of woman before Islam, and he is sure to conclude with us that Islam was first to give marked individuality to woman. Before it, she had none whatsoever worthy the name. We dealt with this subject at some length in our June number, and here we simply give some of the texts :—

#### THE QURAN ON WOMEN.

*"If you (men) have certain rights over women they have similar rights on you in all fairness."*

*"They are your garments and you are their garments."*

*"Men ought to have a part of what their parents and kindreds leave, and women a part of what their parents and kindred leave; let them have a stated share."*

#### FROM THE SAYINGS OF THE HOLY PROPHET.

*"Women are the twin halves of men. God enjoins us to treat women well. The rights of women are sacred; see that women are maintained in the rights attributed to them. The world and all things in it are valuable, but the most valuable thing in the world is a virtuous woman. The best of you are those who are best to your wives. Fear God in regard to the treatment of your wives, for verily they are your helpers, you have taken them on the security of God. To acquire knowledge is an equal duty of man and woman. Woman is sovereign in the house of her husband."*

These are some of the basic principles on which Muslim jurists have framed laws, and they allow such rights to woman as are



still unknown to the modern civilisation of Europe. We will discuss the legal aspect of female rights in some of our subsequent numbers. We invite every seeker after truth to find parallels to the above in pre-Islamic literature.

In conclusion, we ask Mr. Justice Phillimore to consider his own law of property and that in vogue in other European countries, and compare them with the laws of Islam on the rights of women, and he will have to regret his statement.

The remaining portion of Mr. Justice Phillimore's remark hardly deserves serious refutation. It is so unfounded and unjustified that even the *Daily News & Leader* found it necessary to eliminate it from its columns of June 18, when quoting the rest of the passage under our review. "It is amusing to find Christians accusing another religion of using force in the propagation of its teachings. Followers of a creed whose zealots walked knee-deep in the blood of heretics of other faiths and opposing sect."† We fail to understand Mr. Justice Phillimore when he speaks of the earliest and purest days of Christianity. Christianity was pure and simple in the days of the Lord and the time of His Apostles. But it soon saw corruption, and we really feel pained when we ascribe to it what we find in its followers. While they were "serfs and slaves" the Christians could not do "acts of outrage and lawlessness," but when they attained Temporal Power they began the work of "lawlessness." The Pagan, Saxon, Scandinavian, Briton, Gaul, and Iberian were baptised at the point of the sword, or driven to the baptismal font like cattle at the edict of their kings. The Inquisitions, the war in the Netherlands, the thirty years' war in Germany, told how Christians loved each other, and burned, massacred, ravaged in the name of their Saviour. Can Mr. Justice Phillimore, with all his legal acumen, name any act of "lawlessness and outrage" in the eye of the law more culpable than persecution for the sake of conscience? Full 1,500 years, from the time of Constantine till when Rationalism took the ascendancy, within "the last eighty years," Europe more or less has seen human blood unrelentingly shed at the altar of Christianity. This is the past history, but we wonder how could the judge of the Old Bailey lose sight of the recent "lawlessness and outrage" which Christians committed in the Near East in the name of religion. Perhaps the ethics of law in Europe change with the change of religion of those persecuted.

That Islam was spread at the edge of the sword is another old woman's story, befitting a missionary more than a judge, who knows that vague assertions uncorroborated by facts and figures are no proof in any case. We have always denied, and we now again deny, the charge that any Mohammadan king had recourse to the sword, or even to a lesser form of persecution, in proselytising others. Like other false but

---

† "The Review of Religions," Qadian, India.

received opinions, this calumny against Islam was devised and given currency by the missionaries. It remained unchallenged for a considerable time for want of knowledge of it, and was passed as a fact. No religion preached and afforded more toleration to the followers of other religions than Islam. The golden rule of religious toleration, "No compulsion in religion," cannot be found in any other sacred book than the Quran, and Mohammad was the only illustrious member of the blessed race of the prophets, with Jesus amongst them, who could give it practical effect when he gave his famous charter to the Christians of his time, which we reproduce here from our last number for the benefit of Mr. Justice Phillimore, and request him to show us a parallel to it in the history of any other religion of the world.

#### CHARTER TO THE CHRISTIANS

in the Holy Prophet's own words :—

"To the Christians of Najran and the neighbouring territories the security of God and the pledge of His Prophet are extended for their lives, their religion, and their property. . . . There shall be no interference with the practice of their faith or their observances. . . . No bishop shall be removed from his bishopric ; nor any monk from his monastery ; nor any priest from his priesthood, and they shall continue to enjoy everything great and small as heretofore ; no image or cross shall be destroyed."

---

### MOSLEM MONOGAMY.

---

#### SHAIK-UL ISLAM ON WOMAN.

---

THE MUSLEM IS PERMITTED TO MARRY MORE THAN ONE WOMAN UNDER THE STRICTEST RULES AND REGULATIONS. THE RESULT IS VIRTUALLY GENERAL MONOGAMY. THE CHRISTIAN IS FORBIDDEN TO MARRY MORE THAN ONE WOMAN.

THE RESULT IS WIDESPREAD POLYGAMY.

THE Shaik-ul Islam at Constantinople, whose official position resembles that of the Archbishop of Canterbury, was interviewed in the middle of the last month by the reporter of Mr. Hearst's *New York American* to tell his views on women and marriage. The interview occupied three solid columns of the said newspaper, which may be summed up in the above phrase. Islam, according to the Venerable, is far more solicitous for the welfare of woman than any other religion. It maintains her individuality and brings her nearly on equal footing with man. Rights granted to woman in matters of inheritance and property are as yet unknown to others.

## WHITE WIVES OF BROWN MEN.

---

LETTER FROM SIR JOHN REES, M.P.

---

*To the Editor "MUSLIM INDIA."*

SIR,—I thank you for kindly sending me a copy of your issue for July, which gives the opportunity to explain that you are not quoting my words at all, or any article or letter signed by myself, but something published by the London *Daily Mail*. I spoke a few words in the Lobby with a gentleman reporting for a newspaper, I do not remember which; and what is quoted by you is, I presume, what he took down of a hurried and only imperfectly and in some respect erroneously reported conversation. I deprecated mixed marriages, which, I think, rarely turn out well, even so far as I have seen in cases when the differences between the parties are less strongly marked than those which exist between Christians and Mohammadans; but I said I had known cases of marriages of the latter character proving very successful. I never suggested that wives can be sold as slaves in India, and it should be obvious that I could not say any such a thing, and of course never regarded it as possible, let alone desirable, that natives of India should not come to visit natives of Europe and Australia. I agree that the practice of polygamy and the extent to which it is used are misunderstood and exaggerated in Europe, and its evils intensely magnified, and indeed I admit the truth of much of what is said in *Muslim India* on this score, and in regard to the rights of property. I find it odd to be regarded as a hostile critic of Mohammadan institutions and the religion of Islam, which I have always defended from ignorant and unjust criticism, such as I am now accused of using. I hope you will kindly publish this letter, and I am yours faithfully,

London, August 3, 1913.

J. D. REES.

---

## MUSLIM ALLEGIANCE TO THE CALIPH.

---

*To the Editor of THE GLOBE.*

---

SIR,—Writing in reply to Mr. Dixon-Johnson, under the above heading, your correspondent, Mr. C. Mackellar, makes some strange statements as to the Muslim Caliphate and the claims of the Sultan to it. Whatever other stereotyped charges have again been imported by the writer against the Ottoman rule in Europe I need not refute. They can hardly carry any weight with those who know Mr. Mackellar's hostile and biased attitude



towards Turkey in all his writings. But he is decidedly incorrect in what he says about the question of the Muslim Caliphate. He should have looked more to the hard facts facing him, which explain the situation in a different light than to open the pages of the old book by Mr. Hughes. That various Muslim kingdoms were overthrown and dismembered within the last fifty years by European powers in Central Asia and North Africa has all along been within our cognisance, and we never concerned ourselves with this European aggression. But have not all the campaigns against Turkey roused Muslim resentment and anxiety, and called forth co-operation and help? This we observe in the Crimean war, as well as in the late Austrian Expedition against Turkey. The events in the Balkan and Tripoli have created such bitter feeling in India that their continuance is absolutely undesirable in the interest of British rule there. They are eloquent enough to contradict what has been said by Mr. Hughes\* in his dictionary of Islam, which Mr. Mackellar makes his strong point. These indications of Muslim allegiance to Turkey are not confined to India. We find people in Afghanistan similarly concerned, though they have their own ruler in the person of the Ameer. Very recently the independent turbulent Pathan tribes of the Indian trans-borders made representation to British officers, expressing their allegiance to the *Khaleef-a-tul-Muslameen*, and their readiness to go on *Jehád* against the Christian Powers in the Balkan. The Nigerian Moslem Ameers also evinced their chief anxiety about Turkey before the British Governor in the public Durbar. The Sultan of Morocco may be of Koresh, but with all his claim to the Muslim Caliphate, as Mr. Mackellar tries to make out, the former could not deeply affect the Muslim world in his troubles. Writers like Mr. Mackellar are no friends to their own nation. They may be sworn to a certain policy, but they should know that it is not only a futile attempt to prove that the Sultan is not the rightful Caliph, but it creates bad blood between English people and the Muslims. Indiscreet pronouncements by some British statesmen and a portion of the British Press have already done more harm to their own prestige in India than they could help the Balkan Allies.

As to the attempt of Mr. Mackellar to substantiate his assertion on the sayings of the Holy Prophet, he has simply shown his want of knowledge. There is no such decree of the founder of Islam which confines the Caliphate to the tribes of Koresh. No doubt the Prophet Mohammad prophesied that there will be twelve *Imams* (Caliphs) immediately after him from the Koresh, and the holy words found their fulfilment in the begin-

---

\* After a careful study of the whole subject for thirty years, twenty having been spent among the Mosques of the Moslems, I will defy anyone to produce any reasonable proof that any Moslem scholar in India acknowledges Abdul Hameed as the rightful Caliph.

ning centuries of Islam. It is not Karbella, as Mr. Mackellar thinks, but the custody of Mecca and Medina which gives the Sultan his chief claim to the Caliphate. He is admittedly Caliph of the Faithful in the whole Muslim world.

August 16.

KHWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN,  
Editor, *Muslim India*.

—*The Globe*, London, August 21.

## A HINT TO WISE STATESMANSHIP.

THAT unique spirit of jubilation which received its expression in the four corners of India when the news of the capture of Adrianople by the Turks reached there, may serve as a guide to those who take upon themselves to rule the destinies of the largest number of Muslims in the various parts of the world. It shows how closely Indian Muslims are attached to Turkey. It also gives the practical lie to those who have now struck a new note in the Press here, that the Sultan is not accepted as the Caliph of the Muslims in India. Every city and town, with any Mohammedan population, has in its own way given vent to the universal sentiment. A wave of rejoicing pervades the whole country, and the occasion has been ceremonised as a big festival. Columns of newspapers in India are replete with telegraphic messages, showing various modes adopted by Muslims to express public joy. We reproduce two telegraphic messages below, which appeared in the *Observer*, a leading Muslim journal in India, for the enlightenment of the people here, who are again going to be hoodwinked by the mercenaries of the Balkan Allies as to the real Muslim attachment to the Ottoman. The said messages come from two cities of especial import: one is Calcutta and the other Peshawar,—the city of the Pathans and the daily rendezvous of the turbulent bordersmen.

### LORD CREWE

may be right in his view of the case when, in his reply to the London Muslim League, he says that British policy in Europe cannot be guided by Muslim sentiments, which may receive consideration. But our Secretary of State, perhaps, fails to appreciate that the British Empire is a Muslim heritage. We outnumber all the races who are governed by Britain, and no one knows better than Lord Crewe that a civilised government is not an autocracy, but an exponent of the feelings and susceptibilities of its subjects.

Are not the present conditions in India sufficient to change the policy so indiscreetly pursued? What a want of foresight on the part of the present British Ministry to adopt a policy

intended to strengthen British interest and hands in the East, but which proves just the reverse.

#### THE CAWNPOOR MOSQUE.

The sad occurrence of Cawnpoor is another undesirable event, which could have been avoided if the officials there had shown some tact, and adopted that sympathetic attitude which characterises every action of Lord Hardinge. We wonder why a portion of the Press here should try to keep the nation in darkness. Every matter of great importance, which should open the eyes of the people here, and create a public opinion strong enough to affect those who have the reins of the Government in hand, is minimised. A very brief note in some of the London dailies has been thought enough to explain away the conduct of the police at Cawnpoor, which caused the death of twenty unarmed human beings. A Press communique also comes from the Provincial Government to make light of such a serious affair. We deprecate all riotous assemblies, and advise our brethren always to adopt legitimate constitutional measures for ventilating their grievances. But the fault lies with the rulers as well. They seem to pay less heed to public representations. That the demolition of the integral portion of the mosque would excite public resentment, and lead to serious consequences, especially in the present agitated condition of the Muslim mind in India, could easily have been foreseen by an officer of average prudence. Representations were made to all the authorities concerned beforehand, and the situation could have been saved by prompt measures; but the occasion was lost. It is too academic to enter into the question whether the portion of the mosque demolished was an integral part, or an accessory. The Collector of Cawnpoor was not, however, an authority on the subject. He should have referred the matter to the Mohamadan *Ulemas* before he took the responsibility of doing what has been universally believed to be a *sacrilege*.

There is, however, another defect in the whole system of the Civil Service for India which leads to all such official blunders; and, unless some efficient remedy is devised, the popularity of English rule will seriously suffer. With training of mind the successful candidates of the Land Service badly want training of heart. Besides, after passing their competitive examinations, they need a competent knowledge of our social conditions. They should be enabled to appreciate our sentiments and religious susceptibilities before they go to rule India. A nation which can afford to use churches and chapels as theatres and billiard-rooms for six days, in order to utilise the proceeds to keep up the sacred places for Sunday, can hardly sound the depth of those feelings of reverence which an Indian mind feels for his place of worship—a temple or a mosque. But it is the business of the ruling nation to equip her officials with the necessary knowledge. Ignorance, and mere ignorance, has nearly dis-



turbed the peace of the whole country. Indignation mass-meetings condemning the official action in Cawnpoor are swarming everywhere in India. They consist of men of note and import, and yet the so-called recorders of actualities here try to make it out as only an action of the few agitators of the Muslim League. Do they serve the nation by such misrepresentation? We doubt it very much.

"According to a resolution passed by the Muhammadan public of Peshawar city, in their grand meeting held on the 23rd instant in the premises of the Islamia Club, the Musalmans of Peshawar city made a *Chiraghan*\* on the night of 24th in honour of the capture of Adrianople by the Turks and the victory of Turkish arms. They brilliantly lighted their houses, shops and every mosque in the city and tried to exceed one another. Agha Syed Maqbul Shah, with the help of cap merchants, tried his best for lighting up the splendid Masjid of Mohabbat Khan. Within four hours its two minarets, each eighty feet high, were lighted up and their bright light attracted the attention of spectators far and near, affording clear proof of the Muhammadans' universal union and sympathy. Karm Shah's and Hafiz Gauhar Din's mosques were also brilliantly lighted. Bazzars of Kabli gate, Kissakhawani, Misgaran, Lungifiroshan, Bazzazan, Pul Purkhta and Bazar Kalan were comparatively more lighted and overcrowded, being the centre of the city. Sirky Gate Bazaar was lighted very well under the supervision of the Anjuman-i-Talim-ul-Quran. The Afridies of independent territory helped to enlarge the pageant and took keen interest in lighting the mosque of Hafiz Gauhar Din. Two learned men delivered their lectures on Islamic union and prayed for the victory of Turkish arms. Abdulla and Brothers, tea merchants in Kissakhawani Bazar, lighted their own shops and their neighbours. *Madahkhawani* was continued there up to ten. Sethi Sher Ahmad Khan, President of the Literary Society, made good management for lighting Kalanbazer, Dahlan Street was also lighted and Khan Bahadur Haji Karim Buksh also made arrangement for lighting his splendid buildings. The Musalman shopkeepers of Kalanbazar feasted the poor with *pulao*. In short, the Musalmans of the city honoured the day better than their Ids. May God give victory to Turkish arms!"

\* \* \* \* \*

"Calcutta Musalmans presented last night a happy scene in honour of the re-occupation of Adrianople. Prayers and *Mauloods* for Islamic success took place all over. Alms, *sharbats* and sweetmeats were distributed. Processions, with flags, singing Ikbal-ka-Tarana were formed, Chinioti Punjabis taking prominent part. Congratulatory telegram was sent to *Khalifa-tul-Muslimin*.† In streets, shops and mosques, especially Sundrapati, were brilliantly illuminated and music played, most noticeable being Nakhuda Masjid under Imamsahib, Mutwallies and Haji Abdul Latif, Taruchanddud Street under Fazal Karim Sethi and Mian Kaloo Kasab, Haran Bari under Sheikh Abdul Hak, and Hamidiah Hotel and Fireworks by Muhammad Yakoob Muhammad Farukh."

---

\* Illumination of the city.

† Caliph of the Muslimin—i.e., the Sultan.

## THE ENGLISH PRESS ON "MUSLIM INDIA."

REFERRING to the April number of *Muslim India*, T.P.'s *Weekly* writes as follows :—

### ISLAM.

Seeing that we are part of an Empire which contains the greatest number of Muslims, that in a sense the British Empire represents the Muslim, it is remarkable how little one knows of Islamic life and thought. To quote from *Muslim India: The Islamic Review* (J. S. Phillips, 99 Shoe Lane, 6d. net), a Muslim is "one who sacrifices his life and all his interests in the path of God, makes complete submission to Him, and resigns himself solely to His will: one who engages all his faculties in devotion to God, eschews every act of disobedience, and prostrates himself before Him."

### THE SOCIAL IDEAL.

The current number contains an article by Professor Ferozud Din on "Democracy and Socialism in Islam," which reminds one that the Musulman world to-day is by no means free from controversies that we are inclined to regard as European. Also one is wrong in assuming that even in the Middle Ages despotism was of a rigid order. This the following shows: On the occasion of one of the Ids—a day of great rejoicing for Musulmans—so the story says, the children of the fifth Caliph were out at elbows, in tattered clothes, and his wife insisted that he should have new clothes for them. Umar (II.) pleaded that he had not anything left from his day's wages. His wife suggested that he should draw his next day's wages from the Bait-ul-mal in anticipation. The Caliph's face reddened with anger, and he replied: "Are you sure that I shall live till to-morrow and deserve the money I should receive to-day?" It should be borne in mind that this is an incident of the days when the Caliph was one of the greatest monarchs of his age, and his dominions were spread from India to Morocco.

### THE WOMAN'S SHARE.

It is interesting to know, too, what is the real Islamic view of woman :—

"If you (men) have certain rights on them (women), they have similar rights on you in all fairness."  
 "Live and associate with them kindly." "They are your garments and you are their garments."  
 "Men ought to have a part of what their parents and kindred leave, and women a part of what their parents and kindred leave; let them have a stated share."—QURAN II. 228 and 183, IV. 4 and 23.

This suggests that, in Meredith's phrase, "Cape Turk" had been "rounded" long ago by the Eastern. Let us observe, too, what the Prophet said concerning marriage :—

"Whoever marries a woman for her power and position, God but increaseth his humiliation ; whoever marries a woman for her wealth, God but increaseth his poverty ; whoever marries a woman for her beauty, God but increaseth her ugliness ; but whoever marries a woman in order that he may restrain his eyes, observe continence, and treat his relations kindly, God putteth a blessedness in her for him."

There is also an article on the relationship of Islam to Jesus Christ, the nature of which is too controversial for these columns, but the main idea is pertinent. The Islamic view of Christ is a reverent one, but Islamites much resent the current views of Christians who regard them as opponents, and describe their Scriptures as "false." A perusal of Islamic writings tends to encourage a larger view, the more so when the Empire so largely is their heritage.

---

*Light*, August 9, 1913 :—

*Muslim India*, the July issue of which is before us, is a magazine devoted to the interests of the Moslem faith, and is an admirable little periodical, well printed and edited. It aims at helping Christians to understand and appreciate Islam, an object with which, recognising as we do the essential unity of all religions, we have every sympathy. Those who feel any prejudice against the teachings of Mohammed should remember that Great Britain is not only a *Christian but a Mohammedan Power*.\* The editor concerns himself vigorously with the many slanders on Mohammadans which appear at times in the British Press. It is probably true that many social evils are due less to the religious faith of a country than to its imperfect civilisation. And certainly if Moslem newspapers retaliated by producing pictures of some of our British slums and plague-spots as fairly representative of the life of a Christian people we should feel aggrieved. One thing at least the Moslem faith can teach us—the virtue of unity. It is not split up into a multitude of warring sects. It is real brotherhood.

---

Referring to the June number of *Muslim India*, the editor of *The Two Worlds*, Manchester, says :—

The number before me features two contributions as being specially important. The first is a Letter to the Prime Minister, and is a forcible plea for justice to India and her interests as

---

\* The italics are ours.—ED.



containing so large a Mohammadan population. Some straight things are said. . . . The second article is a deeply-interesting paper entitled "Woman : From Judaism to Islam," read by the editor at the Lyceum Club, Piccadilly, London, on the 20th of last month, and a *better presentation of the case for woman has seldom been offered*. The theme is treated partly from the religious point of view, partly from Quranic and Biblical points, and much from an ethical consideration, and every point tells. The citations from the Quran are numerous, and serve to show that under Islam there is a full recognition of the rights of woman as woman.

---

## MR. ASQUITH IN INDIAN PRESS.

---

THE able editor of the *Observer* (Lahore, India), who is distinguished for the moderation of his views and expressions as a journalist, and has recently been conferred a title of "*Khan Sahib*" by the Indian Government, perhaps for the same reason, writes the following in his issue of July 26, 1913 :—

### MR. ASQUITH'S HASTE.

It really passes our understanding to comprehend why the members of the British Cabinet, which administers the affairs of an empire that rules over the largest number of Muslim subjects, should be in such great hurry to threaten Turkey and give expression to ill-concealed chagrin at Turkey's attempts to rehabilitate herself in the eyes of the world at large. Sir Edward Grey was the first of all European statesmen to publicly express the hope that Turkey would not cross the line settled by the London treaty. And now it is Mr. Asquith's turn to hold out a threat to Turkey. Speaking at Birmingham, Mr. Asquith stated that if Turkey were ill-advised enough to defy the treaty of London, she must be prepared for the bringing up of questions which it is in no way to her interest to bring into the debate. Brave language, indeed ; but one which ill befits the mouth of the Prime Minister of the greatest Muslim Power in the world.

### INVIOABILITY OF TREATIES.

Mr. Asquith's insistence on the inviolability of treaties affords an amusing spectacle ; and the question might well be asked if he takes the races of the East for a pack of so many fools, who cannot distinguish between facts and theories and who do not know that the West in its dealings with inferior races has, throughout the long course of dreary years which go to make up history, seldom hesitated to break word with weak peoples whenever it suits her purpose. Unfortunately this is only too true, and the air of injured surprise being now assumed in the Chancellories of Europe is a mask used to conceal the real character of the war in the Balkans. For what is that real character ? We shall explain and shall challenge Mr. Asquith, and all others in the bargain, to say nay to our description, if they can. Four robbers conspired to rob Turkey of the fairest of her possessions, and in the struggle between the robbers and the rightful owner of the lands the latter was worsted and despoiled of her territory. Now that the robbers have fallen out among themselves, Turkey has seen a chance of taking back a portion of the booty ; and yet Europe threatens to intervene in the name of

equity and justice and forcibly prevent Turkey from claiming her rightful due. This is nothing if not absolute mockery of justice. Surely it is even worse. It is an attempt to tie down the hands and feet of the rightful owner and help the robbers to appropriate to themselves what does not belong to them. This is very strange; and yet the strangest part of the whole affair consists in the Prime Minister of the British Empire taking the lead in this game of bluff.

#### MR. ASQUITH'S SILENCE.

Mr. Asquith, who is using strong language in threatening Turkey, never broke the seal of silence, which had been put on his lips for a long time, when the Bulgarians and the other Allies had been guilty of the most inhuman barbarities in the conquered territory, though the testimony of all independent and impartial witnesses was agreed in describing the atrocities as unparalleled in the history of modern warfare. A further testimony comes from a British officer, and it remains to be seen if it will rouse Mr. Asquith to action. Reuter wires from Athens that the British Naval Captain Cardale, who has just returned from Cavalla, says he counted 1,700 corpses of old men, women and children at Doxato, apparently massacred by the Bulgarians. He saw children pierced in such a way that they seemed to have been thrown into the air and caught on bayonets. The blood of innocent martyrs calls for prompt vengeance. Will Mr. Asquith take any interest in this terrible question?

---

### CRITERIA.

---

“On a point of definite urgency this is a matter where it is quite possible that the Christian population of Thrace is being exterminated by the Turkish forces.”—*Noel Buxton, M.P., in the House of Commons.*

It is “possible” that statements of the above kind are those current in the British House of Commons as examples of common sense, and which may also pass unchallenged by a certain section of the public, because it supports previous formed opinions. With men anxious for the truth, it will scarcely be accepted as of value, unsupported as it was by evidence, with its main assertion containing only an outpouring of religious slander founded upon a “possible” occurrence.

It will be noticed that the maker of the statement does not assert that the Christian population of Thrace *is* being massacred by the Turkish forces, he only assumes that it is *possible*. A great many things can be postulated by the human mind as “possible,” but their possibility is no proof that they are occurring or that they ever will occur. For instance, it is “possible” that Mr. Noel Buxton is an ignoramus on Eastern matters; it is also “possible” that he is a hypocrite attempting to obtain popularity by the method of vilifying the members of another nation and religion by an unwarranted insinuation; while it is also “possible” that he is merely stupid and quite unable to judge any issue on the merits of the case. Those



things are "possible," but that is no proof that either of them is true.

One thing is certain, *a gentleman*, before giving utterance to such a statement, would have made sure not that it was "possible" that the Christian population *might be* exterminated by the Turkish forces, but that *they were* being exterminated. I would not care to print a word to name such wanton ethics, yet it passed unchallenged in the House.

Why did not Mr. Noel Buxton rise "on a point of definite urgency," when the Allies, especially the Bulgarians, were devastating Macedonia and Thrace, and murdering unarmed men, women and children?

I am not particularly concerned about Mr. Noel Buxton, but let me summarise the facts for the benefit of others as at present ascertainable :—

#### FIRST, TURKO-ITALIAN WAR.

(1) Before the war correspondents reached the scene of hostilities—

(a) Reports from Italian sources asserted that the Turks and Arabs were exercising horrible cruelties on prisoners, and that massacres of the inhabitants who joined the invaders were common.

2. After the arrival of the war correspondents—

(a) All reports of Turko-Arabian cruelty and massacre ceased. Italian wires on the subject were silent.

(b) The war correspondents reported that no massacres were perpetrated by the Muslims; that Italian reports were false.

(c) They also reported that the Italians had slaughtered the Muslim inhabitants with savage cruelty, men women and children.

(d) Photographs by the correspondents prove this Lieut. Montague, who was an active leader of the Arab levies under the Turks, supports the statements of the correspondents.

(e) The Italians attempted to bribe a British war correspondent (Mr. F. McCullagh) to keep silent on the matter.

#### SECOND, THE TURKO-BALKAN WAR.

1. Before the war correspondents reached the front—

(a) Reports of massacres by Turkish troops.

(b) Those reports issued principally from Sofia, also from Athens and Belgrade.

(c) The reports often contradicted each other, and were contrary to other reports concerning the operations. They were not signed by any person reliable or



otherwise. They did not profess to be reports of eye-witnesses.

2. After the war correspondents reached the front—

(a) Reports of massacres by Turkish troops practically ceased.

(b) British gentlemen in Turkey, British, French, German and Austrian officers and war correspondents, wrote to the Press of their respective nations denying the above reports, which emanated from the capitals of the Allied states. No reliable and independent witnesses have been found to support the statements which issued from Greek, Serb and Bulgar sources.

3. British, French, German and Austrian officers, gentlemen and war correspondents all testify—

(a) To the good behaviour of the Turkish troops.

(b) To the barbarous and cruel treatment of the Muslim population and of the Turkish prisoners by the Allies, especially the Bulgarians and Servians.

As I write there lie before me reports from the leading British and Continental newspapers sent by leading journalists and literateurs who were present at a great number of the butcheries. The reports constitute a veritable volume of horrors. I do not wish to dwell on this point. War is not a merciful thing at any time, even under the banners of the most civilised powers. But I detest the malignity that continually showers scandal upon the Turks and invents excuses for their opponents, in spite of the fact that all along the line those peoples have been the prime movers in the game, and have surpassed the Turk even when he was driven to vengeance.

Mr. RONALD MACNEILL asked: "Whether there was any rule in international law to prevent the Turkish Government denouncing the Treaty of London and taking steps to restore her sovereignty in Adrianople and Eastern Thrace?"

Sir EDWARD GREY said: "He was not aware of any rule in international law that applied. The question appeared to be one of ethics, political expediency and self-interest."

Mr. MACNEILL asked: "Whether at the outbreak of the Balkan war His Majesty's Government and other European Powers intimated to the belligerents that no departure from the *status quo ante bellum* would be permitted to result from the war; and whether the Foreign Secretary would give an assurance that H.M. Government would refuse to join in any coercive policy against the Turks for the purpose of preventing them recovering by force of arms any losses they had sustained in the war, or to consent to the employment of force for that purpose by any other Power or combination of Powers?"

Sir EDWARD GREY said: "The answer to the first part of the question was in the affirmative. The Powers, apart from the matter of Egean Islands and Albania, did not consider it desirable to intervene by force to make good their original views. He could not give any undertaking such as the hon. member desired in the last part of the question. It might entail the separation of H.M. Government from the rest of the Powers under circumstances which had not arisen, and could not be foreseen."

I am not a lawyer, which is probably just as well. My opinion, therefore, for what it is worth, is that there was no Treaty of London to denounce. That Treaty of London referred to was made by Turkey with the Allied States. On the outbreak of war between those States immediately after and on the point at issue—the boundary line—the Allied States as such ceased to exist. Even if that were not so, the Turks were as justified in renewing the war, in the face of such a Treaty, as the Allies were in opening the war at the beginning of hostilities. Whether such a view is correct or not, the Powers and Bulgaria have not much to cavil at; political expediency and self-interest have governed their relations with Turkey for generations. Their own interests have dictated the policy pursued during the present war. Interference in Albania was political expediency and self-interest; it was the same motives sent them back on their word pledged at the outbreak of hostilities not to allow any change in matter of territory. Had Turkey been victorious that pledge would have been kept. Some men may be in a position to question the ethics of all parties concerned, but I do think any concerned in the transactions are in a position to question the ethics of any of the other parties. So far as foreign politics are concerned, ethics have been thrown overboard. Some of us will await with interest the further action of the Powers in the face of the fresh complications, and some of us hope that Britain will take the opportunity of regaining that hold on the people of the East and of India, especially before her policy in Persia, Morocco, and Turkey, shattered their faith in her honour, in her justice and her sympathy. I speak with all sincerity when I say that a continuation of our present policy in foreign affairs will undermine our supremacy in the East and usher in the downfall of our Asian and North African Empire. Some Britishers I know have been passionate enough to assert that we rule by the sword. I hope not. My opinion is that the day we cease to rule by justice and with sympathy, that day will herald the end of our domination and our Empire.

J. PARKINSON.